

## Document Log Item

Addressing	
<b>From</b>	<b>To</b>
Christine Katin/R9/USEPA/US	Karen Goldberg/R9/USEPA/US@EPA Karen Goldberg/R9/USEPA/US@EPA
<b>CC</b>	<b>BCC</b>
Robert Carr/R9/USEPA/US@EPA	
<b>Description</b> <span>Form Used: Memo</span>	
<b>Subject</b>	<b>Date/Time</b>
April 8 - meeting about Treasure Island marina - summary	04/08/2010 05:08 PM
<b># of Attachments</b>	<b>Total Bytes</b>
0	4,007
<b>NPM</b>	<b>Contributor</b>
<b>Processing</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	

Body

## Document Body

Hi Karen-

Today's meeting at Treasure Island was interesting. Isabella ended up calling into the meeting, but was not active in the conversation. Marvin Norman was very active (I did not know in advance that he would be present). Treasure Island Enterprises (the marina developer) was also very active.

The two main issues addressed were (1) what would be the nature of the proposed cap in the preferred alternative ("Alternative 2" - sediment removal to 2.5 feet w/ cap) - would it be incompatible with the proposed marina expansion? and (2) could the preferred alternative be modified without revising the FS to allow for a marina expansion?

The end result of it all was that the City/Navy are going to work on language that would allow a modification of the Navy's preferred alternative ("Alternative 2") at the ROD/Remedial Design phase. It seemed to me that the City wanted assurance from the Navy that the marina expansion would be considered. The language would be a commitment from the Navy to work with the city to design something that would be mutually agreeable. The Navy made it clear that they would not be changing the footprint of the alternative, but that they may consider additional characterization or deeper removal. The City is to get back to the Navy with what exactly it is that would meet their needs. They have not been very clear to date except in stating that the Navy's remedy doesn't work for them. The Navy really wants to move beyond the FS - it has been on hold for over a year due to this issue.

The BCDC component of the meeting was relatively minor. The Navy and BCDC agreed that the Navy would show consistency with BCDC requirements in the documents, but that the Navy would not be requesting a consistency determination from BCDC.

Marvin Norman mentioned to me that he would call you - and that you had called him.

I'm out Friday and Monday, but I'm available later in the week if you have any questions.

-Christine

Christine Katin  
U.S. EPA, Region 9  
San Francisco, CA  
(415) 972-3112